



SDMS Doc ID 2037701

1 Soil responses to sodicity and salinity: challenges and opportunities.

2 J.D. Oster and I. Shainberg

3

4 **Abstract/Summary**

5 Exchangeable sodium and low salinity deteriorate the permeability of soils to
6 air and water. The susceptibility of soils to sodicity and low salinity depend on
7 both: 1) the inherent properties of the soils (e.g. texture, mineralogy, pH,
8 CaCO_3 , sesquioxides, organic matter content and pH) and 2) extrinsic time
9 dependent properties such as cultivation, irrigation method and wetting rate,
10 and the time since cultivation (=aging time). Whereas the effect of inherent
11 soil properties on the soil response to sodicity has been studied and modeled,
12 especially under laboratory conditions, the effect of soil management on the
13 physical response of soils to sodicity has been studied very little.
14 Consequently our ability to predict the changes in soil permeability under field
15 conditions is limited. Including the effect of management on the physical
16 response of soils to sodicity and low salinity is the main challenge facing
17 researchers, consultants and farmers.

18

19

1 Soil responses to sodicity and salinity: challenges and opportunities.

2 J.D. Oster and I. Shainberg

3

4 **Introduction**

5 Currently available research information and computer models provide
6 only a limited ability to predict the impacts of soil sodicity and salinity on the
7 permeability of soil to air and water. To a large extent this stems from two
8 reasons: 1. Laboratory methods used to obtain data do not reflect the
9 conditions that usually occur in the field (Shaw et al. 1998). Most of the
10 laboratory studies that dealt with salinity and sodicity impacts on soil
11 permeability were done in the laboratory using methods (disturbed and dry
12 samples, fast wetting, no aging, flooding or high intensity rain) that enhanced
13 aggregate slaking, clay swelling and dispersion mechanisms (Shainberg et
14 al., this issue). 2. Inherent problems with modeling processes responsible for
15 *changes in soil pore structure – the spatial arrangements among sand, silt,*
16 clay and organic matter --- that can occur, by whatever process that can
17 change them. These processes include clay swelling and dispersion as a
18 result of changes in soil chemistry, aggregate slaking upon wetting, root
19 growth and decay, vehicle and animal traffic, tillage, and cropping.

20

21 There is an increasing obligation to better characterize the response of
22 field soils to salinity and sodicity, and the effect of management on these
23 responses. This is particularly the case for irrigated agriculture. It needs to
24 increase production with less water, in many instances with higher salinity and

1 sodicity, and at the same time to reduce and control negative environmental
2 impacts on surface and ground waters (El-Ashry and Duda, 1999).

3

4 **Soil responses to sodicity and salinity**

5 The diffuse double layer only partially explains the effect of sodicity and
6 salinity on soil permeability (Quirk and Schofield, 1955; Quirk, 1994;
7 Rengasamy and Sumner, 1998). With increasing sodicity or decreasing
8 salinity, the repulsion forces between clay particles increase. At some level of
9 sodicity and salinity along this continuum, which is unique for each soil (Pratt
10 and Suarez, 1990), clay swelling and dispersion occurs. Clay swelling into
11 the water conducting pores, and clay movement and deposition within the
12 pores are two mechanisms responsible for permeability deterioration. The
13 impacts of these mechanisms are affected by several soil factors: texture, clay
14 mineralogy, organic matter, CaCO_3 sesquioxides and pH (Levy et al., 1998).

15

16 In the 1980's, researchers proposed that salinity and sodicity also
17 impacted aggregate disintegration (slaking) (Cass and Sumner, 1982; Abu-
18 Sharar et al., 1987). Soil permeability to water and air depends on the amount
19 and continuity of macropores (> 30) in the soil. Upon wetting, slaking of
20 macroaggregates ($> 250 \mu\text{m}$) into microaggregates ($20\text{--}200 \mu\text{m}$) reduces the
21 amount of macropores which limits soil permeability. Slaking depends on
22 aggregate stability, in addition to the effect of soil sodicity and low salinity. In
23 semiarid regions, where organic matter content is low, aggregate stability
24 increases with increase in clay content, which acts as cementing material
25 (Kemper and Koch, 1966).

1 Aggregate stability depends also on time dependent variables such as
2 the wetting rate of the aggregates (Quirk and Panabokke, 1962; Mamedov et
3 al., 2001), the antecedent moisture content (Kemper and Rosenau, 1984),
4 and aging, the time cohesion forces have to develop (Kemper et al., 1987).
5 Under no-till (Phillips and Phillips, 1984), or pasture (Greacen, 1958),
6 aggregate stability increases with time and the susceptibility of soils to an
7 unfavorable combination of sodicity and salinity decreases (Shainberg et al.,
8 2001). Aggregates are more stable and less susceptible to sodicity when
9 exposed to wetting rates less than 10 mm/hr (Shainberg et al., 2001;
10 Mamedov et al., 2001). This effect of wetting rate is greater for clay soils than
11 for sandy soils. The role of antecedent water content stems from its influence
12 on the rate cohesive forces develop that help stabilize soil aggregates.
13 Development occurs faster in moist soils compared with dry or saturated soils
14 (Kemper and Reserau, 1984; Kemper et al., 1987). This aging effect, which
15 increases with clay content, decreases the susceptibility of soils to
16 unfavorable combinations of sodicity and salinity. Since permeability depends
17 on both the distribution of soil particles within the soil matrix and on aggregate
18 stability, so also the effect of salinity and sodicity permeability of soils
19 depends on soil, water and crop management.

20

21 **Challenges and opportunities**

22 Use of more saline/sodic irrigation waters, such as municipal
23 wastewaters and irrigation drainage waters will accelerate in the future. So will
24 the reuse of more saline/sodic drainage waters generated by irrigation in
25 order to reduce environmental impacts on receiving waters (Tanji and

1 Karajeh, 1993; Oster, 1994). This will generate a need to modify existing soil
2 and crop management practices, or to develop new practices in order to cope
3 with the inevitable increases in salinity and sodicity that will occur.

4 Consequently, the interaction between soil management and soil sodicity
5 under different levels of salinity will continue to be a challenge for researchers
6 and farmers.

7 An important aspect of soil management is the recognition of the
8 different responses of surface and subsurface soils to sodicity and salinity
9 (Oster and Jayawardane, 1998). Surface soils, because of their position, and
10 often tillage, are affected more than subsoils by water drop impact, rapid
11 wetting, irrigation water quality, animal and vehicular traffic, tillage, and
12 surface mulches. The bonding mechanisms associated with organic matter
13 (Nelsen and Oades, 1998) and aging are continually changing in surface soils
14 as compared to what occurs in subsoils. Subsoils have lower wetting rates,
15 the water contents prior to wetting are usually higher, the organic matter
16 content is usually lower, and the chemical state of organic matter is more
17 stable than surface soils. Subsoil tillage and amelioration are expensive.
18 Because of these differences, the criteria of acceptable combinations of
19 sodicity and salinity are different for surface and subsurface soils, as are the
20 methods of soil management.

21 Consideration needs to be given to changing research methods to
22 characterize the impacts of salinity and sodicity to better match what occurs in
23 the field. For example, the differences in water application rates among
24 various irrigation methods likely impact how surface soils respond to sodicity,
25 and consequently the infiltration characteristics of the soil. Vehicle and animal

1 traffic likely have similar effects. For example, 'Will the infiltration rates and
2 grazing management of pastures irrigated with municipal wastewater be
3 different than those irrigated with less saline/sodic channel waters?' is a
4 question that is under consideration at the Institute of Sustainable Irrigated
5 Agriculture at Tatura, Vic. The issue of particular concern is the effect of
6 animal traffic on the physical properties of the surface soil during extended
7 wet periods in the winter rainy season. Irrigation often supplements rainfall,
8 which in turn enhances the negative impacts of sodicity on surface soils
9 almost immediately and eventually on subsurface soils as well if sufficient
10 amounts of rainfall infiltrate. If one overlays different cropping/irrigation
11 systems onto the rainfall issue, the result will be a long list of concerns, which
12 goes beyond the scope of this paper. This diversity is both a challenge and an
13 opportunity in the development of appropriate research strategies and
14 methodologies. This aspect of the future will be enhanced if the research
15 program includes field research and strong linkages with consultants and farm
16 advisors who work directly with farmers to solve problems.

17 As irrigation with more saline-sodic irrigation waters than was common in
18 the past increases, the assessment of the future sustainability of their use
19 becomes an issue. Relevant field data and on-farm experience is for the most
20 part not available. Under these circumstances one has several options: 1. Use
21 existing data and concepts (Quirk and Schofield, 1955; McNeal and Coleman
22 1966; Rengasamy and Sumner, 1998; Levy et al., 1998). 2. Use model
23 predictions based on clay swelling (McNeal, 1968) or based on the Equivalent
24 Salt Solution Series concept (Jayawardane, 1992). They all provide insights
25 into what may happen in the future, but all are based on laboratory methods

1 that do not reflect field conditions. We believe that the challenge to modelers
2 (Jayawardane, 1992; Suarez and Simunek, 1997; Arya, et al., 1999a and
3 1999b) is to incorporate the effect of both soil solution chemistry and soil
4 management into their models. It should be realized that: 1. soil permeability
5 depends on time dependant processes such as aging, cultivation, vehicle and
6 animal traffic, cropping, irrigation, and rainfall, in addition to particle size
7 distribution, clay swelling and dispersion, and 2. the time dependant
8 processes are much more dynamic for surface soils than for subsoils.

9 Another aspect of assessing future impacts is the need to predict soil
10 solution and exchange composition as a function of irrigation water
11 composition and crop water uptake. Changing the irrigation water quality can
12 result in soil chemistry changes that can require more than a decade to occur.
13 This is particularly true for sodification, an increase in soil sodicity with time.
14 This process is buffered by a nonfavorable cation exchange equilibria (Bolt,
15 1978). In order to achieve an equilibrium level of exchangeable sodium, the
16 soil exchange phase must be exposed to many more moles of sodium in the
17 soil solution phase than needed to achieve the new exchangeable sodium, or
18 sodicity level. An example of this, based on laboratory data obtained by David
19 Burrow (private communication, 2000), is the change in irrigation from
20 channel water with an EC of 0.1 dS/m and an SAR of 1.3 to irrigation with
21 Mooroopna wastewater with an EC of 0.8 dS/m and an SAR of 6. Changes in
22 sodicity in the 0 - 0.1 m depth interval were projected to be complete in one
23 year as compared to 30 years for the 0.2 - 0.5 m depth interval (Oster, 2000).

24 The useful aspect of existing hydrosalinity models (Suarez and Dudley,
25 1997) is that they provide insights into how the chemical composition of the

1 soil solution and exchange phases will change with time for a given change in
2 irrigation water quality. Hydrosalinity models such as UNSATCHEM (Suarez
3 and Simunek, 1997) should be put to use to predict the temporal changes in
4 salinity and sodicity when assessing the potential impacts on soil chemical
5 composition as a result of changing from one irrigation water quality to
6 another. An interesting aspect of UNSATCHEM is that it also predicts the
7 impacts of salinity and sodicity on soil permeability based on the work of
8 McNeal (1968). To our knowledge it is the only model that links both soil
9 chemical and physical properties.

10 Finally, the use of waste- and drainage-waters can be expected to
11 increase whether key research is complete or not. What are some possible
12 strategies to foster the sustainable use of these waters? 1. Match alternative
13 cropping options to the constraints imposed by the expected levels of salinity,
14 sodicity and water logging (Oster et al., 1999). 2. Encourage the use of
15 economic incentives to foster the long term dedication of lands irrigated with
16 saline/sodic waters to crop production systems that are most likely to be
17 sustainable. Both strategies would reduce the chances of encountering
18 problems with subsoil permeability and the subsequent need for subsoil
19 reclamation.

20 **Concluding comments.**

21 In the future, soil salinities and sodicities will increase to higher levels
22 in irrigated lands than was considered normal in the past. This will result from
23 using irrigation water more efficiently, and from increasing the use of recycled
24 water. In the past, the focus of irrigation management was on soil reclamation
25 to reduce soil salinity and sodicity to acceptable levels, and subsequently on

1 management options to maintain them. There was little regard to
2 environmental impacts related to the disposal of drainage water. This cannot
3 continue to be the case. In addition, future work needs to also focus on soil
4 and crop management strategies to assure irrigation sustainability at higher
5 levels of salinity and sodicity.

6 Soil salinity and sodicity levels are dynamic: they change with the
7 amount and quality of infiltrated water, evapotranspiration and rainfall. The
8 impact of these changes on soil permeability is only partially predictable
9 because much of the underlying research data obtained in laboratories did not
10 simulate field conditions. The laboratory studies enhanced aggregate slaking
11 as well as the response of soils to clay swelling and dispersion in ways that
12 were not representative of what occurs in the field. Future laboratory and field
13 research needs to address both the inherent soil properties as well as the
14 extrinsic, time dependent properties such as management, cultivation,
15 cropping, and method of irrigation.

16 The situation in regard to predicting changes in soil chemistry, the
17 chemical composition of the solution and exchange phase, is considerably
18 better than that for predicting changes in soil permeability. The available
19 transient and steady state hydrosalinity models need to be put to use when
20 assessing changes in soil chemistry that can occur with changing irrigation
21 water quality and irrigation efficiency and rainfall. Their use should become
22 common.

23 Where the linkages between researchers, public and private farm
24 advisors/consultants, and farmers have been strong, everyone has benefited.
25 Useful research information has been put into use quickly, and the research

1 needs of farmers have quickly come to the attention of researchers. These
2 linkages will continue to be needed and fostered as the use of saline and
3 sodic irrigation water becomes a more common occurrence.
4
5

6 **References**

- 7 Abu-Sharar, T. M., Bingham, F. T., and Rhoades, J. D. (1987). Stability of soil
8 aggregates as affected by electrolyte concentration and composition. *Soil Sci.*
9 *Soc. Am. J.* 51, 309-314.
- 10 Arya, L. M., Leij, F.J., van Genuchten, M.Th, and Shouse, P.J. (1999a).
11 Scaling parameters to predict the soil water characteristic from particle-size
12 distribution data. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 63;510-519.
- 13 Arya, L. M., Leij, F.J., Shouse, P.J., and van Genuchten, M.Th. (1999b).
14 Relationship between the hydraulic conductivity function and the particle
15 size distribution. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 63;1063-1070.
- 16 Bolt, G.H. (1978). Transport and accumulation of soluble soil components. *In*
17 *Developments in Soil Science.* (Eds G.H. Bolt and M. G. M. Bruggenwert). pp
18 xx-xx. (Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co: Amsterdam, The Netherlands.)
- 19 Cass, A., and Sumner, M. E. 1982. Soil pore structural stability and irrigation
20 water quality: Empirical sodium stability model. *Soil Sci. Soc. Proc.* 51, 860-
21 867.
- 22 El_Ashry, M.T., and Duda A.M. (1999). Future perspectives on agricultural
23 drainage. *In 'Agricultural Drainage, Agron. Monogr. 38.'* (Eds R. W. Skaggs
24 and J. van Schilfgaarde.) pp 1285-1298.. (ASA, CSSA, SSSA: Madison, WI.)
- 25 Greacen, E.L.. (1958). The soil structure profile under pastures. *Aust. J. Agric.*
26 *Res.*, 129-137.

- 1 Jayawardane, N. S. (1992). Prediction of unsaturated hydraulic conductivity
2 changes of a loamy soil in different salt solutions by using the equivalent salt
3 solutions concept. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 30, 565-571.
- 4 Kemper, W. D., and Koch, E. J. (1996). Aggregate stability of soils from
5 western USA and Canada. *USDA Tech. Bull.* 1355. U.S. Government Printing
6 Office, Washington, DC.
- 7 Kemper, W. D, and Rosenau, R. C. (1984). Soil cohesion as affected by time
8 and water content. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 48, 1001-1006.
- 9 Kemper, W. D, Rosenau, R. C., and Dexter, A. R. (1987). Cohesion
10 development in disrupted soils as affected by clay and organic matter content
11 and temperature. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 51, 860-867.
- 12 Levy, G. J., Shainberg, I., and Miller, W. P. 1998. Physical properties of sodic
13 soils. *In 'Sodic Soils: Distribution, Properties, Management, and
14 Environmental Consequences.'* (Eds M. E. Sumner and R. Naidu.) pp. 77-94.
15 (Oxford University Press: New York)
- 16 McNeal, B. L. (1968). Prediction of the effect of mixed-salt solutions on soil
17 hydraulic conductivity. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc.* 32, 190-193.
- 18 McNeal, B. L., and Coleman, N. T. (1966). Effect of solution composition on
19 soil hydraulic conductivity. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc.* 30:308-312
- 20 Mamedov, A. I., Shainberg, I., Levy, G.J., and Letey, J. (2001). Prewetting
21 rates and sodicity effects on surface sealing. *Soil Sci.Soc. Am. J.* (in press).
- 22 Nelson, D. M., and Oades, J. M. (1998). Organic matter, sodicity and soil
23 structure. *In 'Sodic Soils: Distribution, Properties, Management, and
24 Environmental Consequences.'* (Eds M. E. Sumner and R. Naidu.) pp. 51-75.
25 (Oxford University Press: New York)

- 1 Oster, J.D. (1994). Management of irrigation water and its ecological impact.
2 Trans. 15th World Congress of Soil Science, Acapulco, Mexico, July 10-16
3 Commission II. Symposia. Vol 3a:332-345.
- 4 Oster, J.D. (2000). Amelioration of sodic soils under groundwater and
5 wastewater reuse-- current practices vs alternative/future strategies.
6 Consulting report: output 1, project 17052. Inst. Sustainable Irrig. Agr. Tatura,
7 Victoria.
- 8 Oster, J. D., and Jayawardane, N. S. (1998). Agricultural management of
9 sodic soils. *In* 'Sodic Soils: Distribution, Properties, Management, and
10 Environmental Consequences.' (Eds M. E. Sumner and R. Naidu.) pp. 124-
11 147. (Oxford University Press: New York.)
- 12 Oster, J.D., Kaffka, S.R., Shannon, M.C., and Grattan S.R. (1999). Saline-
13 sodic drainage water: A resource for forage production? Proc. 17th Int.
14 Congress on Irrigation and Drainage. Vol. 1F, 67-79.
- 15 Phillips, R.E., and Phillips, S.H. (1984). 'No-Tillage Agriculture.' (Van
16 Nostrand Reinhold: New York.)
- 17 Pratt, P. F. and Suarez, D. L. (1990). Irrigation water quality assessments. *In*
18 'Agricultural Salinity Assessment and Mangement.' (Ed. K. K. Tanji). pp 220-
19 236. (ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice 71. American
20 Society of Civil Engineering: New York, NY.)
- 21 Quirk, J. P. (1994). Interparticle forces: A basis for the interpretation of soil
22 physical behaviour. *Adv. Agron.* 53,121-128.
- 23 Quirk, J. P., and Schofield, R. K. (1955). The effect of electrolyte
24 concentration on soil permeability. *J. Soil Sci.* 6,163-178.

- 1 Quirk, J. P., and Panabokke, C. R. (1962). Incipient failure of soil aggregates.
2 J. Soil Sci. 13, 60-70.
- 3 Rengasamy, P., and Sumner, M. E. (1998). Processes involved in sodic
4 behavior. *In* 'Sodic Soils: Distribution, Properties, Management, and
5 Environmental Consequences.' (Eds M. E. Sumner and R. Naidu.) pp. 35-50.
6 (Oxford University Press: New York)
- 7 Shainberg, I., Levy, G. J., Goldstein, D., and Letey, J. (2001) Prewetting rate
8 and sodicity effects on the hydraulic conductivity of soils (this issue.)
- 9 Shaw, R. J., Coughlan, K.J. and Beli, L.C. (1998). Root zone sodicity. *In*
10 'Sodic Soils: Distribution, Properties, Management, and Environmental
11 Consequences.' (Eds M. E. Sumner and R. Naidu.) pp. 95-106. (Oxford
12 University Press: New York)
- 13 Suarez, D. L., and Dudley, L. M. (1997). Hydrochemical considerations in
14 modeling water quality within the vadose zone. *In* 'Agroecosystems and the
15 Environment.' (Eds L. M. Dudley and J. C. Guitjens.) pp. 113-136. (Pacific
16 Division, AAAS: San Francisco, CA)
- 17 Suarez, D. L., and Simunek, J. (1997). UNSATCHEM: Unsaturated water and
18 solute transport model with equilibrium and kinetic chemistry. Soil Sci. Soc.
19 Am. J. 61, 1633-1646.
- 20 Tanji, K. K., and Karajeh, F. F. (1993). Saline drain water reuse in
21 agroforestry systems. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. 119, 841-849.

22